



Paper No. 8

RICHARD M GOLDBERT ESQ
25 EAST SALEM STREET
SUITE 419
HACKENSACK NJ 07601

MAILED

SEP 23 2010

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Patent No. 6,223,937	:
Issued: May 1, 2001	: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
Application No.: 09/441,869	:
Filing Date: November 17, 1999	:
Attorney Docket No. 337/1/003	:

This is a request for information in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed June 29, 2010, to reinstate the above-cited patent.

Petitioner is allowed a non-extendable period for reply of **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mailing date of this communication to provide a response. The response should be titled, "Response to Request for Information." If no response is provided within the period set forth, a decision will be made solely on the merits as set forth in the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b) filed September 28, 2009. No additional fees are due.

The patent issued May 1, 2001. The 3.5 year maintenance fee could have been paid from May 1, 2004, through November 1, 2004, or with a surcharge, as authorized by 37 CFR 1.20(h), during the period from November 2, 2004, to May 1, 2005. Petitioner did not do so. Accordingly, the patent expired at midnight on May 1, 2005. It is also noted that the 7.5-year maintenance fee was missed as it was not paid by May 1, 2009.

Petitioner is required to address the following points:

- A successful petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b) must affirmatively identify the cause of the delay in paying the maintenance fee and provide a statement from every person with first-hand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the delay in paying the maintenance fee. Petitioner must provide statements from any person who may have been charged with paying the maintenance fee and statements from any person with first-hand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the failure to pay the maintenance fee. This would include a statement from Ms. Patrice Michele Potter, who was the paralegal that petitioner implies was responsible for the docketing error which resulted in non-payment of the 3.5-year and 7.5-year maintenance fees for the subject patent.
- 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) sets forth that a petition submitted under this portion of the Code of Federal Regulations must include a showing which is described as follows:

A showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The showing must enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

Petitioner must, therefore, describe the steps that were in place at Baker Daniels to ensure that the maintenance fee was timely paid. This showing would include an explanation of who at Baker Daniels was responsible for paying tracking and paying the maintenance fee and the method this person, or entity, used for tracking the maintenance fee.

- Section 711.03(c)(2) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, provides, in pertinent part that:

In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." *Smith v. Mossinghoff*, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." *Haines v. Quigg*, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

A delay resulting from an error (e.g., a docketing error) on the part of an employee in the performance of a clerical function may provide the basis for a showing of "unavoidable" delay, provided it is shown that:

- (A) the error was the cause of the delay at issue;
- (B) there was in place a business routine for performing the clerical function that could reasonably be relied upon to avoid errors in its performance; and
- (C) the employee was sufficiently trained and experienced with regard to the function and routine for its performance that reliance upon such employee represented the exercise of due care.

A delay resulting from an error, such a docketing error, on the part of an employee in the performance of a clerical function may provide the basis for a showing of unavoidable delay. Such a showing should identify the specific error, the individual who made the error, and the business routine in place for performing the action which resulted in the error. The showing must establish that the individual who erred was sufficiently trained and experienced with regard to the function and routine for its performance that reliance upon such employee represented the exercise of due care. The showing should include information regarding the training provided to the personnel responsible for the docketing error, degree of supervision of their work, examples of other work functions carried out, and checks on the described work which were used to assure proper execution of assigned task.

Petitioner has indicated that CPI docket system was used by Baker Daniels in docketing and tracking the maintenance fees for the subject patent. Accordingly, petitioner must address the following points:

- Provide additional information regarding the Computer Packages Inc. Patent Management System (CPi) and its use in the industry and why it is a reliable system.
- Explain the process used to convert petitioner's data to the CPi system, more specifically what data integrity and error checks were used in the process.

- Explain, in detail, the tests conducted to verify the completeness and reliability of the data converted to the CPI system and provides statements from employees who were involved with the conversion process.
- Explain how the data entry was accomplished and how the error occurred.
- Provide a statement from Ms. Potter, or another person with first-hand knowledge of the failure, explaining how the docket error occurred.

The assignee must be empowered pursuant to 37 CFR 3.73(b) as the assignee for the subject patent is seeking to take action in the patent matter. Accordingly, the response to this inquiry must be accompanied by a 3.73(b) statement, which is enclosed for petitioner's convenience.

Further, it does not appear that the Barnes & Thornburg, LLP has been given power of attorney in this matter. Notwithstanding, a courtesy copy of this inquiry is being mailed to Barnes and Thornburg, LLP. All future correspondence will be mailed solely to the address on record until appropriate written instructions to the contrary are received.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Commissioner for Patent
Mail Stop Petitions
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1460

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300
Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3222.

/Kenya A. McLaughlin/

Kenya A. McLaughlin
Petition Attorney
Office of Petitions

Enclosure: Form PTO/SB/96

Cc:
Gerard T. Gallagher
Barnes & Thornburg, LLP
100 North Michigan
600 1st Source Bank center
South Bend, Indiana 46601-1632

STATEMENT UNDER 37 CFR 3.73(b)

Applicant/Patent Owner: _____

Application No./Patent No.: _____ Filed/Issue Date: _____

Titled: _____

_____, a _____
(Name of Assignee) (Type of Assignee, e.g., corporation, partnership, university, government agency, etc.)

states that it is:

1. ☐ the assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in;
2. ☐ an assignee of less than the entire right, title, and interest in
(The extent (by percentage) of its ownership interest is _____ %); or
3. ☐ the assignee of an undivided interest in the entirety of (a complete assignment from one of the joint inventors was made)

the patent application/patent identified above, by virtue of either:

- A. ☐ An assignment from the inventor(s) of the patent application/patent identified above. The assignment was recorded in the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel _____, Frame _____, or for which a copy therefore is attached.

OR

- B. ☐ A chain of title from the inventor(s), of the patent application/patent identified above, to the current assignee as follows:

1. From: _____ To: _____

The document was recorded in the United States Patent and Trademark Office at
Reel _____, Frame _____, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

2. From: _____ To: _____

The document was recorded in the United States Patent and Trademark Office at
Reel _____, Frame _____, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

3. From: _____ To: _____

The document was recorded in the United States Patent and Trademark Office at
Reel _____, Frame _____, or for which a copy thereof is attached.

☐ Additional documents in the chain of title are listed on a supplemental sheet(s).

- ☐ As required by 37 CFR 3.73(b)(1)(i), the documentary evidence of the chain of title from the original owner to the assignee was, or concurrently is being, submitted for recordation pursuant to 37 CFR 3.11.

[NOTE: A separate copy (i.e., a true copy of the original assignment document(s)) must be submitted to Assignment Division in accordance with 37 CFR Part 3, to record the assignment in the records of the USPTO. See MPEP 302.08]

The undersigned (whose title is supplied below) is authorized to act on behalf of the assignee.

Signature_____
Date_____
Printed or Typed Name_____
Title

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 3.73(b). The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.